16th July 1953]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) A statement[a] furnishing the information is laid on the table of the House.

" (b) The Government sustained a loss of Rs. 9,210-9-0 due to accidents in 1952."

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government are paying anything to Government Transport servants who are involved in accidents, and if so how much money had been spent in 1952?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" There is an Accident Reserve Fund of Rs. 2 lakhs. If the hon. Member would like to know details of expenditure, I should like notice. A separate question may be put on the subject."

Agricultural loans in Anantapur district.

* 527 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA (on behalf of Sri K. V. Vema Reddi) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether, out of the Government grant of twelve and a half lakhs of rupees towards the agricultural loans, allotted for Anantapur district for the relief of the famine-affected agriculturists, about nine lakhs of rupees lapsed to the Government for want of personnel for the distribution of loans before March 1953?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The amount surrendered by the Collector of Anantapur under loans under Land Improvement Loans and Agricultural Loans Acts is Rs. 9,55,000 and the sum surrendered under pumping installations is Rs. 50,000. The surrender was not due to want of special staff."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" The point involved in this question is this. Out of 12½ lakhs of rupees sanctioned by the Government to be disbursed to the peasants under 'agricultural loans', Rs. 9½ lakhs had been returned to the Government. May I know from the Hon. Minister, if this returning of the amount was not due to want of special staff for disbursement of loans, why was it that the Government got it back? Is it because the Government thought that loans to peasants should not be sanctioned or is it because the peasants have not applied for loans or is it because the Government thought that that money is being wasted?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The question and answer give a wrong impression. The hon. Member conveniently forgets that about Rs. 51 lakhs had been disbursed. Only a sum of Rs. 9 lakhs and odd was surrendered. Five tahsildars and 21 Revenue Inspectors were employed for this purpose. As we found money we were rushing to the rescue of peasants. The last allotment was made at the end of the year."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix III on pages 370–371 infra.

[16th July 1953

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the disbursing authorities are held responsible for the recovery of loans and therefore the disbursing authorities are niggardly, cautious and stingy with regard to the sanctioning of these loan applications? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I do not know what the state of affairs were in the Pudukottah Durbar; but, generally, the disbursing authorities are not held responsible."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" On a point of order, Sir, సభ్యులు ఇతర నియోజకవర్గపు విషయముల గురించి మాట్లాడినప్పుడు, ప్రతి తడవ రివిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు, సభ్యులు ఆ విధంగా ఇతర నియోజకవర్గముల గురించి మాట్లాడుటకు అధికారము లేనట్లు, సమాధానమిస్తున్నారు. సభ్యులకు తమ నియోజకవర్గములు తప్ప, ఇతర నియోజకవర్గముల గురించి మాట్లాడుటకు అధికారము లేదా అని అడుగుచున్నాను."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The hon. Member Sri V. Gopalakrishnaiah states that the Hon. Revenue Minister said that every Member should speak from the point of view of his constituency."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah has wholly misunderstood the joke. The Hon. Revenue Minister's idea was not to confine hon. Members each to his own constituency. The Hon. Revenue Minister was tempted to make a joke because an allegation was made that disbursing officers were made personally responsible for loans. They are responsible as all public officials are responsible. There is no question of personal responsibility by way of underwriting a loan."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Is it not a fact, Sir, that as soon as Rs. 12½ lakhs was sent to the Collector of Anantapur district for disbursement as loans, the Collector returned Rs. 9½ lakhs almost within a week? Did the Government investigate into the whole question as to why the Collector returned the amount? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" As I said, the allotment made was in the region of about 61 lakhs of rupees. A sum of about Rs. 51 lakhs had already been spent. As the balance of the amount was allotted late, it could not be disbursed within the period allowed. The actual figures of disbursement will be a little bit more because the figures furnished in the answer to the question are only up to the end of February and not up to the end of March."

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—" In view of the fact that loans were not paid to hundreds of applicants for whom loans were sanctioned by the Government and were surrendered to the Government by the Collector, will the Government at least now consider the fact that the surrendering of the sanctioned amount by the Collector is responsible for the famine situation in Anantapur district and grant an extra quota to that district? "

16th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" All these questions are very useful. But I do hope that the net result will not be that the Collectors will begin to disburse amounts in order to please some people without really looking into the necessity of each case."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" The point I ask for is this. It is true that the Government had spent about Rs. 51 lakhs. The Collector at the time he asked for extra allotment which the Government sanctioned knew that there were serious famine conditions in the district. Within a week after sanction by the Government, the Collector returned a sum of about Rs. $9\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs as could not be disbursed and consequently the peasants were not able to get loans which were due to them. I should say that due to the inadequate arrangements made by the Collector the people were not able to get loans. I should like to know from the Government whether it is a fact or not? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Loans cannot be distributed like hand-bills. The whole thing had to be enquired into."

SRI C. SUBBARAYUDU :—" May I know, Sir, the date of the allotment and the time for disbursement and may I know whether the local representatives made a strong protest against the surrender of this amount and there was ample time even after that to disburse the sums within the limited time? " 10-10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I was lost in the long question, Sir."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" May I know, Sir, why the Government considered it necessary to return the nine lakhs of rupees to the Collector in spite of the fact that the Collector has surrendered it? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The Government returned in order that the money should be disbursed and, as a matter of fact, some money was disbursed."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" From the statement just now placed on the floor of the House, I think the Hon. Minister has restricted the relief that is being given in the famine areas. May I request the Government not to further restrict the very small relief in those distress areas? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The Assembly is particularly the guardian of the finances of the State and I do hope that no impression will be created by which the executive will be led to believe that they should not carry out the instructions as to the distribution of the loans in the same carefull manner as they have been hitherto doing."